DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 339 735 TM 017 646

AUTHOR Olsen, Scott A.; Wilson, Kim
TITLE A Follow-Up of Suspect Sophomore Scores on the COMP Test.
PUB DATE May 91
NOTE 23p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Achievement Gains; Achievement Tests; *College Sophomores; *Educational Assessment; Followup Studies; Higher Education; Interviews; *Objective Tests; Outcomes of Education; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Scores; Student Attitudes; *Student Motivation; *Testing Problems; Test Score Decline
IDENTIFIERS *College Outcome Measures Project; Northeast Missouri State University; Relevance (Personal)

ABSTRACT

The College Outcome Measures Program (COMP) objective test is used by colleges and universities to monitor the success of their undergraduate programs and as part of general assessment efforts. At Northeast Missouri State University (Kirksville), 102 students were identified as having suspect COMP scores based on the three criteria of: (1) COMP total score 20 points or more below the American College Testing Program (ACT) assessment battery composite score; (2) unrealistically high or low freshman to sophomore COMP total score change; and (3) COMP total score below the chance score (130) for the test. Because of student withdrawals and unwillingness to participate, only 45 students were interviewed concerning the rationale behind their performance on the COMP. Students were asked about their orientations with respect to the examination, their perceptions of testing conditions, and their motivation. Results suggest that lack of student motivation to perform well on the sophomore examination was the primary reason for the suspect scores. Test results were perceived as being of little importance or relevance. Recommendations for improving student motivation with regard to this examination are discussed. Seven tables and five references are included. The structured interview is provided. (SLD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

SCOTT A. OLSEN

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED339735

# *A Follow-up of Suspect Sophomore Scores on the COMP Test*

Scott A. Olsen

Kim Wilson

Northeast Missouri State University

May 1991

TM017646



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## PURPOSE OF STUDY

The College Outcome Measures Program (COMP) objective test is used by many colleges and universities to monitor the success of their undergraduate programs and as part of their general assessment efforts. For any given administration of the COMP, there is usually a small subset of students who generate suspect, and probably invalid, scores based upon criteria recommended by American College Testing (ACT), the publishers of the COMP test. The general purpose of this study is to follow up a group of students whose scores were deemed suspect. More specifically, this study will describe this special group of students in terms of factors which could possibly influence sophomore COMP test performance. Moreover, this study will attempt to determine factors that might be considered in the future to reduce the number of suspect test scores.

## DATA

At Northeast Missouri State University (NMSU) the COMP is administered to students as incoming freshman and again to the same students when they are sophomores with at least 45 semester hours of credit. At NMSU freshman and sophomore examinations are required of all students, and students must take sophomore examinations before they can enroll for credit beyond 75 semester hours. All data for this study were obtained at NMSU.

Students who had suspect COMP scores from NMSU sophomore examinations administered during the 1988-89 academic year were the subjects of this study. This special subset of students were identified based upon three criteria suggested by ACT for identifying COMP Total scores that are suspect and probably invalid (ACT, 1990). Specifically, these three criteria are as follows:

1. The COMP Total score is 20 points or more below the ACT assessment battery (entrance examination) composite score to COMP Total score concordance expectation.

2. The freshman to sophomore change in COMP Total score is unrealistically high (a gain of 40 or more points) or unrealistically low (a loss of 10 or more points).

3. The COMP Total score is below the chance score (130) for the test.

Using these criteria, 102 student taking sophomore examinations at NMSU during the 1988-89 academic year were identified as having suspect COMP scores; and of these, only 45 could be interviewed.

Table 1 reports the breakdown of the 102 students initially identified. Notice that after one discounts the 22 who were no longer enrolled at NMSU (mostly early graduates and drop outs), and the 21 that could not be contacted (no current phone or address and perhaps mid-semester drop outs) there were only 59 students that could be potentially interviewed. Out of this potential

TABLE 1
BREAKDOWN OF IDENTIFIED STUDENTS

| Classification of Student | N | % of Total | % of Available |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total population of students | 102 | 100.0 | |
| Students no longer enrolled | 22 | 21.6 | |
| Students unavailable | 21 | 20.6 | |
| Students missing interview | 11 | 5.4 | 18.6 |
| Students refusing interview | 3 | 2.9 | 5.1 |
| Students interviewed | 45 | 44.1 | 76.3 |

59 students, 11 repeatedly did not show up for their interview and three simply refused to participate. This left 45 students (76.3% of those available) who were interviewed, and whose data are the basis of analysis in this study. When interviewed, these students had been enrolled in the undergraduate program between two and six years. One was a graduate student.

The specific criteria met by the 45 students interviewed in this study are summarized in Table 2. Notice that all but three (93.3%) had scores

TABLE 2
STUDENTS CLASSIFIED BY IDENTIFYING CRITERION

| Identifying Criterion Condition Met | N | ( % ) |
|---|---|---|
| A. The COMP Total score was 20 points or more below expected based upon the ACT composite score. | 3 | ( 6.7) |
| B. The sophomore COMP Total score was 10 or more points below the freshman COMP Total score. | 36 | (80.0) |
| C. Both conditions "A" and "B" above. | 6 | (13.3) |

that were identified as suspect because their sophomore COMP Total score was unrealistically low in comparison to their freshman COMP Total score--in fact 10 or more points lower than their freshman score from about two years earlier indicating an improbable loss of knowledge. None of these students scored below the floor of the COMP (criterion three mentioned earlier).

## MEASUREMENT

A structured interview was developed specifically for this study. The instrument attempts to detect the rationale behind the students' performance on the sophomore COMP exam. The structured interview was developed by including questions which were suspected to have an influence on students' performance. These areas focused on factors that may have influenced the way in which the student approached their sophomore examination (e.g. attitude toward the sophomore COMP and toward other exams, attitude toward NMSU and programs at NMSU, lack of understanding of the purpose of the sophomore exam, the degree of seriousness with which the exam was viewed, etc.), testing conditions and circumstances when taking the examination, and motivation to do well on the examination.

After an initial pilot of the structured interview with ten people, small changes were made, resulting in an interview providing a total of 33 ratings, including a final overall rating of the student's motivation based upon the entire interview (See Appendix A). However, due to conditionally asked items (skip-outs), the total number of questions asked each student depended on answers to previous questions.

All interviews were done by a graduate research assistant in the NMSU counseling program, who had taken the COMP test to familiarize herself with the content of the exam prior to data collection. Subjects were first contacted by phone. The interviewer identified herself as a graduate student who was working on a project that dealt with the sophomore COMP test and that she needed to interview the student in person about their thoughts and feelings concerning that test. Students were then reminded which test of the battery of exams taken was the COMP. Students were told that the interview would take between ten and fifteen minutes and that their individual responses would only be known by the researchers. Interviews were set up at the student's convenience.

All interviews were conducted during the spring semester of 1991. All but one interview (which took place at the student's on-campus apartment due to medical circumstances) took place in the interviewer's graduate assistant office, which is shared with another graduate assistant. In the minority of cases where the other graduate assistant was present, the interviewer made sure that the students were not enrolled in any classes taught by that assistant. After introductions, thanking the student for coming, and putting the student at ease, the interviewer reminded the student of which test the

questions would be about and the confidentiality that the students responses would have, and proceeded with the structured interview.

Some common comments volunteered by students are worthy of note. Many students stated that it had been a long time since they had taken the test but they would try to answer any questions. The most commonly asked question was what was planned for the results of the survey. The answer given to this question was that their responses would be analyzed along with other student responses and a research paper would be written which would be read by NMSU administrators and faculty. Many students indicated that they were happy to have been asked for their feedback about the sophomore test.

## ANALYSIS

The analysis of response data will be primarily descriptive in nature, using mean item scores and response frequencies. On some items a neutrality hypotheses will be tested to determine if the mean responses for the group differs significantly from the neutral position on bipolar adjective scales. All statistical tests will be conducted using criteria set for the 0.10 level of significance. All calculations will be done using SAS programing.

## RESULTS

The structured interview of the 45 students who had suspect sophomore COMP scores addressed three types of variables. The first had to do with the orientations students had with respect to sophomore examinations. The second addressed student perceptions of relevant testing conditions that might have had an influence on their performance. The third type of variable aimed at assessing student motivation on the examination.

### Student Orientation to Sophomore Examinations

What was the orientation this special group of students had to sophomore examinations when they took the test? How did they approach the test? Were they serious in responding to items on the test? The responses to these types of questions are reported in Table 3.

TABLE 3
RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ABOUT STUDENT'S ORIENTATION TO SOPHOMORE TESTS

| Item # | Question | Responses | Frequency of Responses | (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | Did you understand the purpose of the sophomore exam at the time of the exam? | Yes | 22 | ( 48.9) |
| | | No | 23 | ( 51.1) |
| 9a | Were you aware that your sophomore exam scores were not in the range that was predicted by your ACT and freshman exam scores? | Yes | 21 | ( 46.7) |
| | | No | 23 | ( 51.1) |
| | | Don't understand | 1 | ( 2.2) |
| 9b | How do/did you feel about this? | Bothers them | 11 | ( 29.7) |
| | | Doesn't bother them | 26 | ( 70.3) |
| 16 | Would you say that your attitude toward taking the sophomore exam was... | Very serious? | 0 | ( 0.0) |
| | | Moderately serious? | 24 | ( 53.3) |
| | | Not at all serious? | 21 | ( 46.7) |
| 17 | Would you say that you approached the sophomore exam like you do a final exam? | Yes | 0 | ( 0.0) |
| | | No | 45 | (100.0) |
| 22 | Did you feel that you gave the sophomore exam a moderate amount of effort (in that you answered the questions that you could in a serious manner and guessed on the rest)? | Yes | 6 | ( 13.3) |
| | | Start serious, end up guessing | 6 | ( 13.3) |
| | | Answer, go back and guess | 30 | ( 66.7) |
| | | No, more effort | 1 | ( 2.2) |
| | | No, less effort | 2 | ( 4.4) |

As seen from Table 3, the majority (51.1%) of these students with suspect scores, said that they did not understand the purpose of sophomore examinations. Only 46.7% were even aware that they had a suspect score, and when asked how the felt about this only 29.7% indicated that it bothered them.

None of the students interviewed said that their attitude toward taking the sophomore examination was "very serious", with 46.7% responding that they were "not at all serious", and the remaining 53.3% indicating that their attitude was "moderately serious." Moreover, all of the 45 students interviewed implied that they would approach sophomore examinations less seriously than they would approach a course final examination. However on item 16, all but 4.4% classified themselves as putting forth at least a moderate amount of effort.

Table 4 reports the attitudes of the 45 students interviewed toward standardized testing and toward NMSU at the time of sophomore exhumations. Responses to these questions were rated on a 9-point bipolar adjective scale with negative scores indicating closeness to "dislike" and positive scores indicating closeness to "like" with the midpoint of zero indicating a neutral

TABLE 4
STUDENT'S ATTITUDE AT THE TIME OF SOPHOMORE EXAMINATIONS

| Item # | Question | Response Scale | Response Mean | H0: Mean=0 P>\|t\| |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | How strongly do you like or dislike standardized testing on tests? | -4=Dislike +4=Like | -0.667 | 0.0287 |
| 5 | How strongly did you like or dislike NMSU at the time of the exam? | -4=Dislike +4=Like | 1.38 | 0.0001 |
| 6 | How strongly do you like or dislike NMSU now? | -4=Dislike +4=Like | 1.60 | 0.0001 |
| 8 | What do you like and dislike about NMSU's programs and experience? | #Likes - #Dislikes | 0.36 | 0.1177 |

attitude. For item 8, which called for students to state in open-ended fashion a number of likes and dislikes, the 9-point scale is simply the difference between the number of likes stated minus the number of dislikes

stated. The hypothesis that the mean attitude was neutral (Mean=0) was tested for each of these four items. The results indicate that students significantly liked NMSU both at the time of sophomore examinations and at the time of this study's interview, but that students significantly disliked standardized tests.

Based upon the findings of this section, it seems reasonable to conclude that these students did not invalidate their tests out of negative feelings toward the university. However student's attitude toward standardized testing may have had an influence, and may be related to the moderate to low degree of seriousness with which these students took sophomore exams.

## Student Perception of Testing Conditions

Seven questions in the structured interview of students with suspect sophomore COMP scores dealt with testing conditions. Responses to these questions are reported in Table 5. Generally, based upon items 11-14, there did not seem to be anything that happened during the administration of the examination that would have increased the likelihood of suspect scores. However 31.1% of those interviewed could remember something that might have affected their performance (item 10) and 86.7% had complaints about the way they felt while taking the exam (item 15). These last two factors could influence the suspect nature of the resulting test scores.

## Student Motivation

Table 6 reports four different ratings of student motivation. Each rating was given on a 9-point scale with negative scores representing degrees of being unmotivated (very unmotivated = -4) and with positive scores representing degrees of being motivated (very motivated = +4). For each item

TABLE 5
TESTING CONDITIONS

| Item # | Question | Yes | (%) | No | (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | Can you remember anything that may have affected your performance on the day of the sophomore exam? | 14 | ( 31.1) | 31 | ( 68.9) |
| 11 | Can you remember anything that occurred during the exam which may have resulted in a score that may not reflect your abilities? | 3 | ( 6.7) | 43 | ( 93.3) |
| 12 | Did you understand the directions of the sophomore exam? | 44 | ( 97.8) | 1 | ( 2.2) |
| 13 | Were you allowed sufficient time to fill out the personal information on the answer sheet before the test began? | 42 | ( 93.3) | 3 | ( 6.7) |
| 14 | Did the people who were reading the instructions reduce the time of some sections of the sophomore exam? | 2 | ( 4.4) | 43 | ( 95.6) |
| 15 | How did you feel while you were taking the sophomore exam (any complaints)? | 39 | ( 86.7) | 6 | ( 13.3) |
| 23 | Do you remember any courses that helped you with the content of the sophomore exam? | 7 | ( 18.4) | 31 | ( 81.6) |

the hypothesis that the level of motivation was neutral (Mean=0) was tested. All four ratings significantly differed from this hypothesized neutral point. Indeed, all pair-wise differences between these four means would also be significant.

The overall rating of motivation that the interviewer gave at the end of each interview was the most negative. The second worst (most negative) level of motivation specifically addressed motivation on the sophomore examination (item 1). However, motivation on the freshman examination, the same

standardized test taken about two years earlier at NMSU, was significantly positive, and the highest level of motivation was related to class room examinations. Notice that of the examinations students have taken, it is only the sophomore examination that suffers from lack of motivation for these students who had suspect scores. Even the freshman examination which was a standardized test and hence not liked by these students (recall Table 4), was taken with positive motivation. These results considered together with the results reported in previous tables and remarks made by students during interviews suggests that the incentives to be motivated and perform well on the sophomore examination are simply much less strong than on class room tests where a grade is at stake or on freshman examinations where beginning students tended to have the perception that results might affect their status at the university.

TABLE 6
STUDENT MOTIVATION

| Item # | Question | Response Scale | Response Mean | HO: Mean=0 P>\|t\| |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | How motivated were you in taking the sophomore exam? | -4=Very unmotivated +4=Very motivated | -1.16 | .0001 |
| 2 | How motivated were you about the freshman exam? | -4=Very unmotivated +4=Very motivated | 1.20 | .0001 |
| 3 | How motivated are you about class room exams (eg. finals)? | -4=Very unmotivated +4=Very motivated | 2.93 | .0001 |
| 33 | Subjective overall rating | -4=Very unmotivated +4=Very motivated | -2.02 | .0001 |

Seven questions on the structured interview of students with suspect sophomore COMP scores addressed factors that might potentially improve motivation on sophomore examinations. Each of these questions were rated on a

9-point bipolar scale with negative scores indicating responses closer to a "No" (-4 = NO), and positive scores indicating responses closer to a "Yes" (+4 = YES), with the neutral response scored as a zero. As in previous sections the neutrality hypothesis (Mean=0) was tested for each item. The results for each of these seven items is summarized in Table 7.

TABLE 7
WHAT WOULD HAVE IMPROVED MOTIVATION

| Item # | Question | Response Scale | Response Mean | H0: Mean=0 P>\|t\| |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Would you have been more motivated by the sophomore exam: | | | |
| 25 | If a high score would have resulted in a free elective to replace a required course? | -4=No +4=Yes | 1.87 | .0001 |
| 26 | If a low score would have resulted in additional advising? | -4=No +4=Yes | -0.18 | .6847 |
| 27 | If a high score would have resulted in a $5 gift certificate to the college bookstore or anything else of equal value? | -4=No +4=Yes | -0.91 | .0312 |
| 28 | If a low score would have resulted in additional course work? | -4=No +4=Yes | 1.60 | .0001 |
| 29 | If government funding for NMSU was based on exam scores? | -4=No +4=Yes | 0.40 | .2990 |
| 30 | If you understood the purpose of the test? | -4=No +4=Yes | -0.18 | .7245 |
| 31 | If you knew that you would have received more feedback on your scores (eg, from advisor)? | -4=No +4=Yes | 0.93 | .0198 |

As seen from Table 7, four of the incentive items (25, 27, 28, 31) were significant. Three would have improved motivation, and one would lessened motivation. The three factors that would have improved motivation were (1) if high scores would have resulted in a free elective in place of a required

course, (2) if low scores would have resulted in additional course work, and (3) if students knew they would receive more feedback on their scores (e.g. from advisor). Interestingly the incentive that would have lowered motivation on the sophomore examinations was if high scores would have resulted in a five dollar gift certificate at the college bookstore.

It should be pointed out that item 30 was not used for all 45 students interviewed. If on item 7 (see Table 3) the student indicated that they clearly understood the purpose of the sophomore examination, they were not asked to respond to item 30. Hence, on the average, students who did not understand the purpose of sophomore examinations reported that, had they understood the purpose, they would not have been motivated at a level significantly different from neutral. However, it is important to note that a neutral rating on these items probably represents a substantial improvement in motivation from what would otherwise exist, judging from results in previous tables. Indeed, both item 30 and item 26, while not positive, represent significantly better motivation than if, for example, a five dollar reward were offered (item 27).

To summarize personal motivation seems to be a key issue for this special subgroup of NMSU students with suspect sophomore examination COMP scores. Those interviewed clearly reported a lack of motivation on sophomore examinations, even though they had positive motivation on other examinations at NMSU. Based upon the questions addressing a range of possible incentives to do well on the COMP, it would appear that factors linking sophomore test results with personally relevant consequences could have changed motivation for these students, whereas institutionally relevant consequences or a simple reward would have made no significant difference.

## CONCLUSIONS

The basic underlying question addressed in this study was: What factors are related to the COMP performance of those students who earned suspect scores? Based upon the interviews with 45 students who had suspect scores on their sophomore examination at NMSU, some probable answers begin to appear.

The results of this study suggest that lack of student motivation to perform well on the sophomore examination was the primary reason for the suspect scores. However, this was not a general lack of motivation. It was lack of motivation specifically at the time of the sophomore examination and specifically on the sophomore examination. Indeed, motivation on other tests, both earlier and later in relation to the sophomore examination time frame, was much higher, even on other standardized tests which this select group tended to dislike. Why might this be the case?

The data suggests some areas that are probably not potential problems, and hence can be eliminated from consideration. First, it is very unlikely that these 45 students did not take sophomore examinations seriously due to a dislike for NMSU in general or specific NMSU programs, either at the time of sophomore examinations or some other time. Students reported quite clearly that they liked NMSU. Secondly, there were no unusual complaints about the conditions associated with the administration of the test or their particular testing sessions; so, possible influence in this area can be eliminated. Third, it is unlikely that students would produce unrealistic scores solely because they tend to dislike standardized tests, since motivation on other tests was reported to be higher and reasonable scores seemed to result on other tests.

As a whole the data for this select group students suggests two likely reasons behind the suspect scores on the sophomore COMP examination. The first and probably most general of these reasons was a perception that the results would have little if any relevance, usage or consequence personally affecting the student. The second reason was that many students (86.7%) reported some complaint about the way they felt during the examination. In fact, it is likely that both of the above reasons were present and interacting with one another for many, if not most, of the students interviewed. Of these two reasons, the first probably deserves the more serious consideration, since the severity of complaints corresponding to the second reason would generally, in themselves, not be sufficient to result in the extremely unrealistic scores obtained.

What would have improved motivation for these students on their sophomore COMP test? The most potent of potential motivators would appear to have been things directly linked to the students course work at NMSU--for example, if a high score would result in a free elective in place of a core requirement, or if a low score would result in additional course work. The second most potent motivator would have been to insure that students receive more feedback on their sophomore COMP scores by advisors, or perhaps by others. Though not significantly positive, it is likely that additional motivation, over what would otherwise exist, would have resulted by insuring that students understood the purpose of the examination and its importance to their university, and/or if low scores would have resulted in additional advising.

Based upon the findings in this study what recommendations are appropriate to reduce the number of suspect and invalid scores in future sophomore examinations at NMSU? First, it is recommended that all NMSU

students be made aware of the purpose of sophomore examinations. Certainly this should be done at the beginning of the test by test administrators, but also it should be done by advisors and faculty in general. Indeed, even if this did not have the potential of reducing the number of invalid scores, it is an established ethical principle in educational measurement that examinees be informed of the purposes and uses of any test that they are required to take. Students should be made aware of the test's purpose in terms of its importance to the university and program assessment, in terms of indirect consequences program assessment has for students, and in terms of any direct consequences test results could have for individual students.

Secondly it is recommended that test results be linked with advising both to give better, more meaningful feedback to students regarding their scores, and to enhance the personal relevance of scores to students and their educational planning at NMSU. Assuming that one of the purposes of advising is to help students select courses that will remedy identified weaknesses in their liberal arts and sciences skills, then sophomore examination results are logical sources of information to aid the advising process. If students were made aware, through the advising process, that sophomore test results did influence the advice given by advisors, the results of this study would suggest that this could have a significantly positive impact upon motivation.

The extent to which sophomore scores should be linked to either additional course work or free electives in place of core courses is debatable and not necessarily part of this recommendation. However, based upon research linking course patterns to scores on sophomore examinations (Olsen, 1990; Olsen, 1991), it would be possible to experiment with some form of systematic course waiver consistent with certain levels and patterns of test scores. This would be consistent with the reasoning that if a student can demonstrate

a high level of competence with respect to general education objectives that certain courses are designed to bring about, then perhaps there is reduced need to force a student to take the core course anyway.

Finally, it must be recognized that this study investigated the responses given by a selective group of students chosen because of the suspect and extreme nature of their sophomore COMP scores. Other more typical students were not interviewed. Group comparisons were not possible. An interesting extension to this study would be to compare this special group of students to the other students taking the examination on the structured interview used in this study or on other relevant measures of student characteristics and university variables.

## REFERENCES


ACT, *Review of COMP Development: Instrument Design and Evaluation of the Objective Test for Use in Program Evaluation.* College Outcome Measures Program (COMP), American College Testing Program, 1990.

Forrest, Aubrey and Steele, Joe M. *Defining and Measuring General Educaton Knowledge and Skills.* College Outcome Measures Project, American College Testing Program, 1982.

Olsen, Scott A. (1990). Examining the Relationship Between College Core Courses and Sophomore Critical Thinking Test Scores. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual conference. Boston.

Olsen, Scott A. (1991). Examining the Relationship Between College General Education Science-oriented Course Work and CAAP Science Reaasoning Scores. Paper presented at the American Educatiional Research Association annual conference. Chicago.

Olsen, Scott A. and Plassmeyer, Mary. (1990). Predicted NMSU Sophomore CAAP Critical Thinking Test Scores Based Upon Entering Freshmen Scores on the ACT and COMP Examinations. Northeast Missouri State University, Kirksville, Missouri.

## APPENDIX A

Structured Interview

1. How motivated were you in taking the sophomore exam?
__Very motivated __
__Motivated __
__Undecided __
__Unmotivated __
__Very unmotivated __
- So were you excited by the idea of taking this test?
- So were you willing to give the test your best shot?
- So were you indifferent to the idea of taking this exam?
_ So were you aggravated by having to take this test?

2. How motivated were you about the freshman exam?
__Very motivated
__Motivated
__Undecided
__Unmotivated
__Very unmotivated
Same questions as above.

3. How motivated are you about class room exams e.g. finals?
__Very motivated
__Motivated
__Undecided
__Unmotivated
__Very unmotivated

4. How strongly do you like or dislike standardized testing on tests?
Dislike.....Like
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

5. How strongly did you like or dislike NMSU at the time of the exam?
Dislike.....Like
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

6. How strongly do you like or dislike NMSU now?
Dislike.....Like
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Why don't you like NMSU?
-
-

7. Did you understand the purpose of the sophomore exam at the time of the exam?
__Yes-don't ask 30- ask to explain/give examples
__No-explain:to monitor the success of undergraduate. core programs, for quality control and critical thinking.

8. What do you like and dislike about NMSU's programs and experience?
- (Number of likes)
-
- (Number of dislikes)
-
-

9. Were you aware that your sophomore exam scores were not in the range that was predicted by your ACT and freshman exam scores?
__Yes-How did you find out__Advisor __Guessed __Scores
__No
__Don't understand -explain. Can contact advisor for score.
How do/did you feel about this?

10. Can you remember anything that may have affected your performance on the day of the sophomore exam? (e.g. illness, upsetting event too little sleep, etc.)
    -
    -
    -
11. Can you remember anything that occurred during the exam which may have resulted in a score that may not reflect your abilities? (Monitoring process)
    -
    -
    -
12. Did you understand the directions of the sophomore exam?
    __Yes
    __No
13. Were you allowed sufficient time to fill out the personal information on the answer sheet before the test began?
    __Yes
    __No- Did you find this annoying or distracting? __Yes __No
14. Did the people who were reading the instructions reduce the time of some sections of the sophomore exam?
    __Yes
    __No
15. How did you feel while you were taking the sophomore exam?
    -
    -
    -
16. Would you say that your attitude toward taking the sophomore exam was...
    __Very serious?
    __Moderately serious?
    __Not at all serious?
17. Would you say that you approached the sophomore exam like you do a final exam?
    __Yes-go to 18
    __No -go to 22
18. Do you remember any courses that helped you with the content of the questions on the sophomore exam?
    -
    -
19. Do you prefer essay tests or multiple choice exams?
    __Essay
    __Multiple Choice
    __No Preference
      Why?- do better, easier, quicker
20. Did you try as hard on the freshman exam as you did on the sophomore exam?
    __Yes
    __No
21. Did you try as hard on your ACT entrance exam as you did on the sophomore exam?
    __Yes
    __No
      Go to 25

22. Did you feel that you gave the sophomore exam a moderate amount of effort? (in that you answered the questions that you could in a serious manner and guessed on the rest)

__Yes __start serious-end up guessing
__No -more effort- go to 17 __answer-go back and guess
__No -less effort- go to 24

23. Do you remember any courses that helped you with the content of the sophomore exam?

-
-

Go to 25

24. Do you feel that you did not apply much effort to the sophomore exam by guessing on the majority of the questions?

__Yes
__No -more effort- go to 25

25. Would you have been more motivated by the sophomore exam:
-if a high score would have resulted in a free elective to replace a required course?

__Yes (1, 2 or 3)
__Maybe (4, 5 or 6)
__No (7, 8 or 9)

26. -if a low score would have resulted in additional advising?

__Yes (1, 2 or 3)
__Maybe (4, 5 or 6)
__No (7, 8 or 9)

27. -if a high score would have resulted in a $5 gift certificate to the college bookstore or anything else of equal value?

__Yes (1, 2 or 3)
__Maybe (4, 5 or 6)
__No (7, 8 or 9)

28. -if a lower score would have resulted in additional course work?

__Yes (1, 2 or 3)
__Maybe (4, 5 or 6)
__No (7, 8 or 9)

29. -if government funding for the NMSU was based on exam scores?

__Yes (1, 2 or 3)
__Maybe (4, 5 or 6)
__No (7, 8 or 9)

30. -if you understood the purpose of the test?

__Yes (1, 2 or 3)
__Maybe (4, 5 or 6)
__No (7, 8 or 9)

31. -if you knew that you would have received more feedback on your scores, example advisor?

__Yes (1, 2 or 3)
__Maybe (4, 5 or 6)
__No (7, 8 or 9)

32. Can you think of any incentives that may have caused you to be more motivated in taking the sophomore exam?

-
-

33. Interviewers overall rating of student motivation.

Highly motivated 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Very Unmotivated